

**REMARKS**

By the above actions, claim 14 has been amended, with the remaining claims left unchanged. In view of these actions and the following remarks, further consideration of this application is requested.

At the outset, the undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner's Primary Examiner for agreeing to discuss this case with the undersigned due to the Examiner's early commencement of maternity leave. Claim 14 has been amended above in conformance with the tentative agreement with respect to language which should overcome the outstanding rejection of claims 14-28 based on the newly cited Amo et al. patent application publication for the reasons noted more fully below.


In particular, currently amended claim 14 recites the fact that the present invention allows display devices to be "arranged in a freely configurable order with respect to location but coordinated with respect to each other in a manner enabling a viewer to view a sequenced presentation despite movement of the viewer between different locations which are not arranged in a linear sequence." For example, as set forth in the last paragraph of page 7 of the substitute specification, the present invention makes it possible for:

a plurality of display devices to be disposed separately from one another in several rooms or in different locations. For example, in a first room, a viewer can view a first sequence of a film at time  $t$ , and a second sequence of the film in a second room at time  $t_{sub.2}$ . In this case, the difference in time between the playing time of the first sequence and that of the second sequence can preferably be precisely adjusted to the average period of time that it takes the viewer to walk from the first room to the second room. Thus, in spite of the different rooms, the viewer will see a seemingly continuous sequence of the film

A recognized by the Primary Examiner at the interview, this is different from the concept of Amo et al. in which information is displayed on screens on multiple elevators since no coordination of the images between elevators is necessary because people will not be moving from elevator to elevator in any set manner or in a way warranting a sequenced presentation. Likewise, it was also recognized to be different from the situation where a person on a train or moving sidewalk will be passing a series of displays without interruption so that the sequence need only be timed to the speed of the train or moving sidewalk.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being found, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or an new issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating prompt approval of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
David S. Safran  
Registration No. 27,997

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C.  
PO Box 10064  
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: 703-584-3273

DSS:kmm